

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
NV Energy/ BLM Admin. Site U/G Distribution Line**

PREPARING OFFICE

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Elko, Nevada 89801
(775) 753-0200



Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

NV Energy/ BLM Admin. Site U/G Distribution Line

Prepared by
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Elko District, Tuscarora Field Office
Elko, Nevada

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)	1
--	----------

This page intentionally
left blank

List of Tables

Table 1.1. List of Preparers	3
Table 1.2. Cooperating Agencies	3

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Worksheet

This page intentionally
left blank

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE::Tuscarora Field Office, LLNVE02000

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-E020-0017-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: NVN-093786

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Linear Type Right-of-Way (ROW)

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T. 34N., R. 55E., section 1, S1/2NW1/4

APPLICANT (if any): NV Energy

A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

NV Energy is proposing to construct an underground 25kV distribution line right-of-way to encompass approximately .036 acres of public land located on the BLM administration site. The project is for BLM and is in support of the EDOC Power Improvement project servicing the out-buildings east of the Admin-Warehouse Building. The proposed right-of-way is approximately 160 feet long and 10 feet wide. There will not be any need for any additional workspace during construction and construction is only expected to last for 5 days.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name*	Elko Resource Management Plan	Date Approved:	<u>March 1987</u>
-----------	-------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

**List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)*

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

The Elko Resource Management Plan, as approved March 11, 1987, is silent on the Proposed Action. However, it is consistent with the objectives for the management lands, right-of-way corridors, access, recreation, livestock management, wildlife, and minerals as prescribed and identified in the Record of Decision of the Resource Management Plan (BLM 1987, p.1-4).

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Environmental Assessment BLM/EK/PL-98/027; Decision Record/FONSI signed May 6, 2004

Environmental Assessment EA-NV-010-2-036; dated June 17, 1982

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g. biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

N/A

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Yes, the land acquired in the land exchange was acquired and analyzed for the purpose of supporting administration facilities and related appurtenances. The withdrawal EA for the administration site was for the development of that land. The land has been developed for many years. The proposed action is to provide electricity in support of the administrative buildings analyzed in the documents.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource value?

Yes, however, those alternatives are no longer feasible since the BLM administration site has already been developed.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes, the existing analysis is still valid since the administration site is within city limits and the surrounding parcels of land are also developed. The BLM administration site and related appurtenances has been developed for many years.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Yes, the administration site is already built on an existing withdrawal that had review under NEPA. The proposed action would support the administration site and would therefore have similar effects.

5. Are there public involvement and interagency reviews associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes, the required public involvement was done during the NEPA process of the above mentioned EA's for the administrative buildings.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Table 1.1. List of Preparers

Name	Role	Discipline
Marissa Murphy	Project Lead	Realty Specialist
Deb McFarlane	AFM, Non-Renewable	

Note

Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

Table 1.2. Cooperating Agencies

Agency Type	
Contact Name	
Contact Date	
MOU Number	
MOU Signed Date	
Address	
Parts Jointly Developed	

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.

/s/ Marissa Murphy

Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Terrell K. Dobis

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Richard E. Adams

Signature of the Responsible Official

04/29/2015

Date

Note:

The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.